Political Extremism, Racial Issues, and the British National Party

The Labour-controlled media are very quick to label anyone who disagrees with them as extremists. One group that they have stuck this label on is the British National Party. The aim of this paper is to put forward the view that far from being a dangerous extremist group, the BNP are actually a very sensible and moderate option for the British electorate to seriously consider supporting, and that a careful look at "New" or "Old" Labour, will show that when it comes to dangerous and extremist views, they are where this label is very applicable.

Free Speech and Democracy

A free and impartial press are an important part of a genuine democracy. Do supporters in this country of a pro-democracy party, such as the BNP need to fear persecution because of their views? The answer is "yes". There are various supression of the truth laws under which openly talking about certain facts can lead to prosecution. Mass media propaganda has brainwashed the general public into believing that it is acceptable to persecute anyone who does not agree with the ruling party's point of view.

Immigration and Race

This country is a part of Europe. The only people who have the moral right to be here are Europeans (= White people). The BNP are seldom referred to without the attachment of the term "racist". The Race Relations Act (1976) is a law which discriminates heavily against the indigenous population. An institution called the Commission for Racial Equality was set up under this Act. The credibility of this institution with a name like that can be rated on the same level as the Flat Earth Society: Different races are different - by definition. Are some races superior to others? Is the standard of living in Mocambique equivalent to the standard of living in Switzerland? Can you consider the current level of European evolution and technological development (an advancement of society which includes such things as literacy, electricity, computers, mobile phones and clothes made out of cloth) superior to that of the negriod people of sub-Saharan Africa (hunter-gatherer people - not even subsistance agriculture, no forms of reading or writing, and sometimes wearing animal skins to cover their bodies)? The answer is a very definite and obvious "YES" - we can consider ourselves superior to the savages in Africa. The immigration prob-

lem in this country is based mainly on racial differences. People of other race groups want to come and live here because the standard of living here is higher due to the fact that this country is run by Europeans (and thus has the status of a civilised country). Standards of living in Mocambique, Rhodesia and South Africa were as good as, if not better than those here in the 1950's to the times in the particular country of the end of European rule. Standards in those countries are now, not what we could term as "decent and civilised."

Last year (2000), the overall cost to the British taxpayer of the "asylum seeker" problem was estimated at £ 8 billion. (£ 8 000 000 000 : that is an awful lot of zeros!) This is just a part of the total cost to the British taxpayer of the "Race Relations Industry." The cost to the tax payer of the "Race Relations Industry" is huge. One point to note also, is that the Labour Party's racial equality policies are racially extremely biased. They have a set of chosen "pet ethnic groups" that get special treatment and special favours at the expense of others, especially the indigenous population. Take a careful look at race related policies and you will see that Chinese people don't get any special treatment for being Chinese, but resources, favours and kind treatment is heaped on those who are black or Indian (and by Indian, I include those Indians from the part of India that is ruled by Muslims - and who hate and kill their fellow Indians because they are Hindu). Go to the library, tax office (Inland Revenue), doctors surgery, or other similar place, and you will find information leaflets printed in all sorts of totally alien languages - Gujurati, Hindi, Tamil,... The official language of this country is English. The official languages of the EU include English, French, German, and other European languages. How much tax payers money has been wasted on the production of these "information leaflets?" If you can't speak the language of the country you should not be living here!

Law and Order

The cost of the crime problem is huge. Consider the cost of time of police, courts, keeping huge numbers of aliens living in luxury in our prisons, what you pay to the insurance companies in higher premiums due to theft and vandalism comitted by all these non-Europeans who should not be here.

There is no doubt that immigration has caused huge crime problems in this country. Although the indigenous population make up the majority, most crimes are committed by non-Europeans. Certain race groups tend to commit certain types of crimes. Prison population is 80% non-European. There is a race bias in convictions. A classic example is the OJ Simpson case - let off for a double murder because he is black. Yes, that was in the US, but the unwillingness to be accused of racism by convicting any ethnic minority for their crimes is even stronger here. Different types of people are different, and behave differently. A black sub-Sarahan African is a hunter-gatherer - if he sees something that he thinks may be of use to him he gathers it up and takes it away. Perfectly acceptable in his own environment - BUT considered as theft under the legal and social structures here

in Europe. There is an old South African saying: "You can take a kaffir out of the bush, but you can't take the bush out of a kaffir." The Brixton riots of 1981 are excellent proof of this statement! Here you had blacks, many of which were born in this country, and descended from ones born in Jamaica, which are the descendendents of slaves imported into America hundreds of years ago - in other words, a large number of generations removed from their roots of savagery in Africa, and under different types of civilised influence - yet they still behave as savages.

Race related crime - vast majority of reported victims are European - once again a race bias in reporting has to be taken into account. A European being targeted for mugging by a black will be reported as only a mugging, the race element will be ignored. However, if the victim fights back and injures the mugger, then it will be counted as a racially motivated assult against the black by the European victim. Every crime committed in this country by a non-European is totally unacceptable due to the fact that we should not have any non-Europeans here.

Environmental Issues

This country is overcrowded. Labour are planning to build huge numbers of houses on "green field" sites to house all the immigrants they are constantly importing. This country is overcrowded, and does not need immigrants. All of the Labour arguments for immigration are flawed: aging population, skill shortage, low birth rate.

Taxation and Social Security

Labour policies put a great tax burden on the British taxpayer. The benefits received by this group are little. The NHS runs largely on charity. Foreign Aid is a huge waste of our tax money: ex-colonies that decided to become independent should be allowed to be so - that means they are no longer propped up by our resources.

Economic Considerations (and the morals of globalisation)

British industry has suffered greatly under the policy of globalisation, which brings cheap foreign imports. There is also a moral issue here, the fact that many of these cheap goods are made by slave or child labour.

Labour Party vs British National Party: Who has the Radical Policies?

Labour is really a single issue party. In the late 1940's they took on their issue of anti-white racialism and focussed the entire party policy on it. How can this be explained? Labour has always had strong links with communism. After WWII the USSR saw the "West" as its enemy, and the cold war began. The most powerful element of this enemy, of course was the British Empire. The USA may have declared independence in 1776, but

it is still very much connected with here - they even speak the same language! Despite the fact that the (White) people of America are descended from peoples from all over Europe, with significant Italian, Irish and Polish components, we don't have a set of "official languages" there - one nationality was the dominant one in the making of the USA. The Russians discovered an excellent weapon to use against the British Empire - the native peoples in various parts of the empire. "Liberation Struggles" were started and heavily fuelled by Russia (and Communist China) all over the place - Malaysia, Africa, India. Heavy communist infiltration into the Labour Party was not difficult since the rot was already heavily intrenched in there. The task of the traitors in the Labour Party was to import the communist fuelled problems from various parts of the empire into the heart of the mother country. Labour's policy of mass immigration was started. Insiders in the Labour Party could be led to believe that it was not self-destruction of themselves and their country, but good political policy, since being the party on the side of all these non-European immigrants, they would always get their vote (a fact that still holds to-day - almost every non-European who bothers to vote, votes Labour[1]) so the more immigrants they imported, the stronger their position of getting into power would be. In recent years the three parties Lib, Lab and Con have become almost indistinguishible, starting from when Maggie turned the Conservative Party into the Progressive Liberal Party. Before that there were differences between Labour and Conservative. What distinguishes the Liberals from Labour? Not much now.

Notes

As a side issue, perhaps separate from this paper, we need to look at the other places of European settlement - current, the Americas, Australia and New Zealand, and past, Africa and Asia. You can see that, wherever you find European people in places like Africa and India, they have made huge positive contributions there - the converse is not true - the people from there have, in general, only made negative contributions here. The reasons for the migration have been very different. All countries in sub-Sarahan Africa were made by Europeans. There was no such thing as the concept of a country among the local people before the Europeans introduced it. Most of Africa was uninhabited by people just a few hundred years ago. The hunter-gatherer life style with no form of medical science or technology cannot support a very large population. The current huge population of Africa is purely a White man's creation, a result of the introduction of agriculture and medicine.

Another issue worth looking at from a racial point of view is America. The "American Indians" are often referred to as "Native Americans" - but archeological evidence has shown that there were Europeans living in America long before the ancestors of those Indians came across from Asia. They are just as the name implies - Indians, which is why the Euro-

[1] Democracy is a western European thing - it does not exist at all with most other types of people in other parts of the world.

peans who later went there thought they were in India. Note that the attitude to racial differences in America is very different to that here, despite enormous effort by the liberal political correctness teams, the much longer time span that the Americans have had a black problem, makes them far more open about racial differences.

The other largely European settled place to look at is Australasia. Once again there were different circumstances and conditions there to those in Africa and America.